

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 11, and 13-15 are pending in this application, the independent claims being claims 1 and 6. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 6 are amended. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives during the August 17, 2006 personal interview by Examiner Korobov and Supervisory Examiner Najjar. The substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Objections and Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action has objected to claim 1 as containing an informality and rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 U. S. C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. By this Amendment, Applicants have made amendments to rectify any deficiencies. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections and rejections under 35 U. S. C. 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Office Action has rejected claims 1, 5, 6, 11, and 13-14 under 35 U. S. C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rowe (U. S. Pat. No. 5,819,301). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Rowe does not teach a document data transmission device including a summary data selection means for identifying and extracting the requested specific summary among the plurality of summary data stored in the storage means based on the summary data transmission request, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 6.

In contrast, Rowe discloses a system for downloading individual pages of an electronic document. In Rowe's system, after a document is identified and located, when a user requests the document, a host server first delivers the header and the range table. (See

lines 19-40 in column 25). The header and the range table do not include a bookmark (See Fig. 3b and note that the bookmark is a *special object*). Therefore, the bookmark, which the Office alleges is "summary data," is not downloaded when the user requests the document, but when the user performs an operation on its viewer after the user has already selected the document. (See lines 36-43 in column 27).

In view of the above, it is clear that Rowe does not disclose identifying and extracting a specific bookmark among plurality of bookmarks based on a bookmark request; it discloses merely retrieving a bookmark that is part of the already selected document. Accordingly, Applicants assert that Rowe fails to disclose a summary data selecting means for identifying and extracting a requested specific summary data among the plurality of summary data stored in the storage means based on the summary data transmission request, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claim 6.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that rejection under the 35 U. S. C. 102(b) claims 1 and 6, as well as dependent claims 5, 11, 13 and 14, by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 6, in addition to the other features they recite, be withdrawn.

III. Rejections Under 35 U. S. C. 103(a)

The Office Action has rejected claims 3, 4, 8, 9, and 15 under 35 U. S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe in view of Weideman (U. S. Pat. No. 6,775,519). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Weideman fails to overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Rowe. In particular, Weideman does not disclose or suggest a summary data selecting means for identifying and extracting specific summary data among the plurality of summary data stored in the storage means based on the request, and thus does not supply the subject matter lacking in Rowe. Thus, Applicants assert that, Rowe and Weideman, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited


in claims 3, 4, 8, 9, and 15. Applicants respectfully request that 35 U. S. C. 103(a) rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present Amendment has placed the application in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of the claims and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John S. Kern
Registration No. 42,719

JAO:JSK/tls

Date: August 24, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--